

Date: Wed, 7 Sep 94 04:30:12 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #427
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Wed, 7 Sep 94 Volume 94 : Issue 427

Today's Topics:

 Equipment modification & the FCC
 More Code. (2 msgs)
 Novice class licence and remote computer access. Is it legal?
 Sum'tin for nut'in and chicks for free (2 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Wed, 7 Sep 1994 02:19:12 GMT
From: news.Hawaii.Edu!kahuna!jeffrey@ames.arpa
Subject: Equipment modification & the FCC
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <CSLE87-060994114800@145.39.1.10> CSLE87@email.mot.com (Karl Beckman)
writes:

>
>By the way, does anybody understand the difference between "marine" and
>"maritime" operation as defined by the FCC?? Marine is when you are inside
>the coastal limits of the USA and therefore subject to FCC jurisdiction.
>Maritime operation is ONLY in international waters and you are then subject
>only to the International Maritime requirements.

Sorry, but if you hold a US license and you use that license to
transmit on the 'maritime' frequencies you are subject to US/FCC
laws, no matter where in the world you are.

Date: Wed, 7 Sep 1994 03:11:24 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!sdd.hp.com!saimiri.primite.wisc.edu!news.doit.wisc.edu!
facstaff.wisc.edu!bmicales@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: More Code.
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <34gjgl\$ai4@cat.cis.Brown.EDU> md@pstc3.pstc.brown.edu (Michael P. Deignan) writes:

>bmicales@facstaff.wisc.edu (Bruce Micales) writes:

>> If you are timing out a repeater than you are not using the proper
>> operating technique (also a skill). I made a mistake when I got my first 2
>> meter rig by calling out a general CQ (CQ CQ CQ from WA2DEU) - as I was
>> quickly informed. Some of the operating practices on HF and VHF are very
>> different.

>We recently had an old timer show up on a statewide-coverage machine
>calling CQ. People laughed at him. But, they forgot that when this ham
>got licensed, 2 meters was an experimental band and there was no such
>thing as a repeater. You made a contact on 2 meters by calling CQ. He was
>quite pleasant and had alot of interesting
>anecdotes about amateur radio to share.

However, 2 meters is no longer an experimental band and unless you are operating simplex, the accepted technique is not to call CQ but merely inform others your are on frequency ("This is WA2DEU monitoring" or "WA2DEU monitoring"). Therefore, the statement stands: operating practices differ from HF and VHF. IMHO, you should learn about them preferably before operating on that band (hind sight is always 20/20 :-)).

However, I am glad to hear that no one held this against him and you all (opps - there goes my Southern ancestry :-)) had a pleasant chat.

>> Yes SSB is speech, however, if you do not understand the slang than how can
>> you communicate??

>Uh, with english, maybe? "This is KD1HZ. Anyone on the repeater with time
>for a brief chat?"

Cute....of course with English! Just in those times when you need to pass information quickly, understanding those slang (I prefer short hand) terms, might help....just like Q signals on CW.

Bruce Micales

WA2DEU

P.S. How about: "This is KD1HZ. Anyone on frequency for a signal check?" or "This is KD1HZ monitoring."

```
>MD
>--
>--  #queue <dire_straits.voc>
>--  "I want my,
>--    I want my,
>--    I want my free CB..."
```

Date: Wed, 7 Sep 1994 03:26:47 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!sdd.hp.com!saimiri.primate.wisc.edu!news.doit.wisc.edu!
F180-174.net.wisc.edu!bmicales@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: More Code.
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <34gk6c\$auq@cat.cis.Brown.EDU> md@pstc3.pstc.brown.edu (Michael P. Deignan) writes:

```
>From: md@pstc3.pstc.brown.edu (Michael P. Deignan)
>Subject: Re: More Code.
>Date: 6 Sep 1994 02:29:32 GMT
```

>bmicales@facstaff.wisc.edu (Bruce Micales) writes:

```
>> Not true - a friend of mine has (and others have) used the factory approved
>> mods for their HT to extend the receive frequencies.
```

```
>Oh boy. Really tough stuff, these days.
```

```
>Step 1. Open case.
>Step 2. Snip colored wire
>Step 3. Close case.
```

```
>I stand corrected. They're all Real Hams(tm) now.
```

True they are easy, however, you stated that no one modifies their radios any more....there was nothing indicating the degree of difficulty to this statement.

```
>> What about schematics?  My Yaesu came with one.  True, a lot of todays
>> construction techniques use surface mount technology or other technologies (
>> making it hard to work on), but I can read the schematic (a skill developed
>> when getting my license).
```

```
>Oh sure, most people can read a schematic. That's a capacitor. That's a
>resistor. Hand a schematic to someone today and ask them to identify the
>455khz IF circuitry. Not to mention all the custom chips manufacturers
>have in their radios -- you can't identify them and know their function
```

>without appropriate information from the manufacturer.

Again, you stated that no one knew what was in their radio...no specifics were given. Some schematics do come with block diagrams that nicely point out what the chip may do and the ID of that chip (my ICOM IC-2GAT does).

>> However, I believe within these skills is the "given" that
>> you can "troubleshoot" your equipment and fix it. Troubleshooting and
>> repair are not common sense, they require that you know something of the
>> equipment which you are working on (hmmmm, sounds like a skill to me!).

>If you call keying up your radio and knowing whether or not you've made
>a contact with someone else a skill I guess I'd agree with you.

No - this is not what I mean. What does a change in SWR mean? What can cause it? How do I locate the problem and fix it? These are just some examples of "troubleshooting" and repair that a ham should be able to do. Also, we should not be afraid of seeking the help and/or advice of other hams.

Bruce Micales
WA2DEU

Date: Wed, 7 Sep 1994 03:37:31 GMT
From: netcomsv!netcom.com!russek@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: Novice class licence and remote computer access. Is it legal?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Help!

I'm very excited about getting into Amateur Radio. One of the MAJOR reasons why I started up the hobby is so that I can remotely controll my 486 dx 50 from a small 8086 palmtop PC remotely(through a 2 meter HT). After studying for the test, I noticed one question's answer says that you are "NEVER" allowed to have an unattended transmitter. On the other hand it expressly states that in the 2 meter band, remote access is allowed. I don't get it! Does this mean I can or cannot have my PC unattended doing either DATA or what I hope to be the first to design, Voice recognition and artificial intelligence(sorta like the well hatted "BOTS" on IRC, only now on 2M HAM :) I will only have a Novice licence when I start this, I'm going to test for technician plus but I haven't studied the Tech stuff enough(element 3 ques.) Please E-mail me back so I know what to work around.

P.S. for those techies out there, I've modified some pagers to operate off the 144Mhz range and I plan to use them as Radio Modems, I figure that a pager would have EXCELENT resistance from noise and reliable high speed

capabilities (It also puts out a perfect serial signal if ya tap the processor) Nice way to give pagers to the whole family w/o paying the local pager companies.

Thanks in Advance for the help, hope to be on the air soon!

- Cory -

Also, where beside internet can a person go to get this kind of info?
AND WHERE ARE ALL THE RADIO MAGAZINES!?!?! I went in to 3 book stores and not one of them had a radio magazine.

L8R

Date: 6 Sep 1994 20:04:12 -0600
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!howland.reston.ans.net!spool.mu.edu!
mnemosyne.cs.du.edu!nyx10.cs.du.edu!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Sum'tin for nut'in and chicks for free
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <34ijf2\$h4c@chnews.intel.com>,
Cecil A. Moore -FT-- <cmoore@fallout> wrote:
>Most of the no-code tech's I know are engineers. A couple are PhD's.

Not around here (the Houston area).

>So you believe that graduate EE's are detrimental to the Amateur Radio
>Service? Don't you realize that you have engineers to thank for the
>existence of radio?

Go back and read what I wrote. I don't think graduate EEs are detrimental. I do think that only graduate EEs would be detrimental, and I think that making exceptions in the requirements for any group would be detrimental. Everyone should be required to take and pass any elements of the test that they are physically able to.

--

Jay Maynard, EMT-P, K5ZC, PP-ASEL | Never ascribe to malice that which can
jmaynard@admin5.hsc.uth.tmc.edu | adequately be explained by stupidity.
The US Constitution: 1789-1994. RIP.

Date: 6 Sep 1994 20:07:08 -0600
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!
howland.reston.ans.net!spool.mu.edu!mnemosyne.cs.du.edu!nyx10.cs.du.edu!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Sum'tin for nut'in and chicks for free
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <34ik6m\$h4c@chnews.intel.com>,
Cecil A. Moore -FT-~ <cmoore@fallout> wrote:
>The reason that the non-technical population have a ham radio to talk into
>is because radio was (and is) an engineer's playground. Technical and non-
>technical folk are not in competition... they complement each other.

Agreed. Why, then, do you want to run off the non-technical types by skewing
the exams toward the graduate EE? That's exactly what your proposal would
cause.

>Have you any _rational_ reasons for believing that engineers might
>"cause destruction of the service"?

Again, go back and read what I wrote. I don't think that engineers would
cause destruction of the service. Favoring engineers _AT THE EXPENSE OF NON
ENGINEERS_ would.

--

Jay Maynard, EMT-P, K5ZC, PP-ASEL | Never ascribe to malice that which can
jmaynard@admin5.hsc.uth.tmc.edu | adequately be explained by stupidity.
The US Constitution: 1789-1994. RIP.

Date: Wed, 7 Sep 1994 02:49:30 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!sdd.hp.com!saimiri.primite.wisc.edu!news.doit.wisc.edu!
F180-174.net.wisc.edu!bmicales@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <34fban\$eaj@cat.cis.Brown.EDU>,
<bmicales.265.2E6BA474@facstaff.wisc.edu>, <1994Sep5.165256.155@cam1>,
Subject : Re: More Code.

In article <1994Sep5.165256.155@cam1> henderson@mln.com (Javier Henderson) writes:
>From: henderson@mln.com (Javier Henderson)
>Subject: Re: More Code.
>Date: 5 Sep 94 16:52:56 PDT

>In article <bmicales.265.2E6BA474@facstaff.wisc.edu>, bmicales@facstaff.wisc.edu
(Bruce Micales) writes:

>>

>> If you are timing out a repeater than you are not using the proper
>> operating technique (also a skill). I made a mistake when I got my first 2
>> meter rig by calling out a general CQ (CQ CQ CQ from WA2DEU) - as I was
>> quickly informed. Some of the operating practices on HF and VHF are very
>> different.

>>

>> Yes SSB is speech, however, if you do not understand the slang than how can

>> you communicate??

>Ahm, in English maybe? Or Spanish, Italian, etc, whatever the local language
>is.

Cute....but, my question is more to the point --- if you don't understand
the "shorthand" (or slang) then you may not be able to effectively
communicate.

Bruce Micales
WA2DEU

P.S. The key words are MAY NOT and EFFECTIVELY (sorry for the caps...just
for emphasis).

Date: Tue, 6 Sep 1994 16:58:02 GMT
From: world!dts@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <090294164801Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>, <lenwink.208.0007C172@indirect.com>,
<34e3h4\$9c3@gti.gti.net>
Subject : Re: Tandy's Proposed Family Radio Service

In article <34e3h4\$9c3@gti.gti.net>, Glen Johnson <wb2mpk@gti.gti.net> wrote:
>Problem with a fee-based license is that money can't go to the FCC to be
>used to enforce the rules. The FCC gets whatever money Congress says it
>can have, and every dime the FCC collects for anything goes into the
>General Fund, a.k.a. that great black hole all your tax money goes into.
>

So we need to get Congress to change the rules. As you say, the
money goes wherever congress says it goes. Congress CAN pass a law
indicating that funds from any given source go to a particular place.
Just because funds at the moment go into the common fund does not
mean that it MUST be that way.

Even with the money going to the general fund, the FCC will have a better
case for GETTING money from the general fund for enforcement when they can
show dollars being ADDED to the general fund from license fees. This is
a common approach in business settings as well.

If funds are not collected from fees, they will be collected from your
income taxes, or services will not be provided at all. There's no free
lunch, employees of any organization have to be paid, etc. Sooner or
later, you get services of some sort for your dollars.

--

